



1/RW
Docket No.: C15043/91752DIV1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)
Paul N. HOLVOET and Désiré J. COLLEN) Examiner: L. Cook
Serial No.: 10/802,709) Art Unit: 1641
Filed: March 17, 2004)
For: ASSAYS, ANTIBODIES, AND)
STANDARDS FOR DETECTION OF)
OXIDIZED AND MDA-MODIFIED LOW)
DENSITY LIPOPROTEIN)

**RESPONSE TO NOVEMBER 28, 2006 OFFICE ACTION, INCLUDING AMENDMENT
AND RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Receipt of the November 28, 2006 non-final Office Action (a restriction requirement), which allowed a one-month shortened statutory period for response, is acknowledged. Filing of this paper is timely because it is being deposited with the United States Postal Service (with a Certificate Of Mailing) on or before December 28, 2006.

Applicants do not believe that any fee is required in connection with this paper; however, if any fee is so required, please charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 02-4467.

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Applicants hereby elect the Group II claims (nos. 72 and 73) with traverse and without prejudice.

Traverse is made for various reasons, including reasons analogous to those set forth in the Response To Restriction Requirement Of February 14, 2001, mailed March 14, 2001, in parent application Serial No. 09/446259. Thus, for example, claims 68 and 70 of the Group I claims (nos. 56-71) concern, respectively, antibody mAb-4E6 (claimed in the Group II claims) and antibody mAb-8A2 (claimed in the Group III claims). There is no good reason to split Groups II and III from Group I. Furthermore, there is no good reason to split kit claims (Group V) from assay claims (Group I), even if there is not perfect overlap. Many of the same subclasses will have to be searched for the various claim Groups.

Reconsideration of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested.

AMENDMENT

Please amend the application as follows.